JSJ decompositions of doubles of free groups

Simon Heil

November 7, 2016

Abstract

We classify all possible JSJ decompositions of doubles of free groups of rank two and their corresponding modular groups. We then compute the Makanin-Razborov diagram of a special double of a free group and deduce that in general limit groups are not freely subgroup separable.

arXiv:1611.01424v1 [math.GR] 4 Nov 2016

This work was motivated by a discussion on mathoverflow.com [Mo], whether or not a limit group (or equivalently a fully-residually free group) is freely subgroup separable. A group L is called freely subgroup separable if for every f.g. subgroup $A \leq L$ and every element $g \in L \setminus A$ there exists a homomorphism φ from L into a free group, such that $\varphi(g) \notin \varphi(A)$. If limit groups would have this property, then together with the fact that free groups are subgroup separable, one could deduce the nice result of Henry Wilton that limit groups are subgroup separable (see [Wi]).
Henry Wilton conjectured that one can show that limit groups are not freely subgroup separable by computing the Makanin-Razborov diagram of a special double of a free group (which is a limit group). For the definition of a Makanin-Razborov diagram we refer the interested reader to [Se].
We are following this approach and try to describe Makanin-Razborov diagrams of doubles of a free group in two generators. In the first section we compute the Makanin Razborov diagram of such a double in a special case and use this diagram to show that limit groups are in general not freely subgroup separable. Unfortunately we were not able to give a description of all possible Makanin-Razborov diagrams of general doubles of free groups but at least we are able to classify all possible JSJ decompositions of these doubles in the second section. This is the first step towards the construction of more examples of MR diagrams or even to the possible classification of all MR diagrams of doubles of free groups of rank two in the future.

1 Makanin-Razborov diagrams of doubles of free groups

We first fix some notation. Let $F_2 = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle$ be a free group, $w \in F_2$ and G_w the double of F_2 along $\mathbb{Z}$ given by the embedding $\iota : \mathbb{Z} \to F_2, 1 \mapsto w$. In the following we denote such a double decomposition of G_w along w by $G_w := A *_C B$ where $A = F_2(a_1, a_2)$, $B = F_2(b_1, b_2)$, $C = \langle c \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}$ with the embeddings $\iota_A : C \to A : c \mapsto w_A$, $\iota_B : C \to A : c \mapsto w_B$, where w_A (w_B) is the image of w under the canonical isomorphisms from $F(x_1, x_2)$ to A (B) given by $x_i \mapsto a_i$ ($x_i \mapsto b_i$), $i \in \{1, 2\}$.
In this work, we will view the modular group $\mathrm{Mod}(G)$ of a group G as a subgroup of $\mathrm{Out}(G)$. For a definition of the modular group of a group G we refer the reader to [Se].
We are now going to describe the Makanin-Razborov diagram of G_w for a very specific word, a so-called C-test word:

Definition 1.1. *[Iv] Let F_n be a free group in n generators. A non-trivial word $w \in F_n$ is a C-test word in n letters if for any two n-tuples $(A_1, \ldots, A_n)$, $(B_1, \ldots, B_n)$ of elements of a non-abelian free group F the equality*

$$w(A_1, \ldots, A_n) = w(B_1, \ldots, B_n) \neq 1$$

implies the existence of an element $S \in F$ such that $SA_iS^{-1} = B_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

Remark 1.2. *Let F_n be a free group of rank $n \geq 2$.*

1. *The definition of a C-test word does not depend on the rank of the free group F. This follows from Sela's solution of the Tarski problems, since being a C-test word w in n letters can be expressed by the following first-order sentence:*

$$\forall a_1, \ldots, a_n \forall b_1, \ldots, b_n \exists s : \ (w(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = w(b_1, \ldots, b_n) \neq 1) \Rightarrow (a_1 = sb_1s^{-1} \wedge \ldots \wedge a_n = sb_ns^{-1})$$

2. *[Tu] A C-test word w is in particular a test word and hence Turner proved that it is not contained in a proper retract of F_n.*

3. *[Iv] If a C-test word w in n letters is not a proper power, then the stabilizer of w in $\mathrm{Aut}(F_n)$ is $\langle c_w \rangle$, where c_w denotes conjugation by w.*

The following result is due to Ivanov.

Theorem 1.3. *[Iv] For arbitrary $n \geq 2$ there exists a word $w_n \in F_n$ which is a C-test word in n letters for any free group F_m of rank $m \geq 2$. In addition w_n is not a proper power.*

D. Lee in [Le] generalized this result to the following:

Theorem 1.4. *[Le] For arbitrary $n \geq 2$ there exists a word $w_n \in F_n$ that is a C-test word in n letters such that w_n is not a proper power and with the additional property that for elements $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ in a free group F the following is equivalent:*

(a) $w_n(A_1, \ldots, A_n) = 1$.

(b) The subgroup $\langle A_1, \ldots, A_n \rangle$ of F is cyclic.

Hence we get the following corollary.

Corollary 1.5. *[Le] There exists an element $w \in F_m$ such that if φ is an endomorphism of F_m, Ψ is an endomorphism of F_m with non-cyclic image, and $\varphi(w) = \Psi(w)$, then $\varphi = c_S \circ \Psi$ for some $S \in \langle \Psi(w) \rangle \leq F_m$.*

Definition 1.6. *We call a C-test word in 2 letters which satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.4 and Corollary 1.5 an **Ivanov word**.*

The following corollary follows immediately from the proof of the above theorem in [Le].

Corollary 1.7. *Let $F_2 = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} w =& [x_1^8, x_2^8]^{100} x_1 [x_1^8, x_2^8]^{200} x_1 [x_1^8, x_2^8]^{300} x_1^{-1} [x_1^8, x_2^8]^{400} x_1^{-1} \\ & \cdot [x_1^8, x_2^8]^{500} x_2 [x_1^8, x_2^8]^{600} x_2 [x_1^8, x_2^8]^{700} x_2^{-1} [x_1^8, x_2^8]^{800} x_2^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

is an Ivanov word.

To construct the Makanin-Razborov diagram of a double G_w we first have to understand the JSJ decomposition (in the sense of Rips and Sela) of G_w. We start with the following observation.

Lemma 1.8. *Let $w \in F_2$ and G_w the double of F_2 along w. G_w is one-ended if and only if w is not a power of a primitive element in F_2 (here primitive means part of a basis of F_2).*

Proof. By Corollary 1.5 in [To] G_w is one-ended iff A is one-ended relative to $\iota_A(C)$, i.e. iff there does not exist a free splitting $A_1 * A_2$ of A such that $\iota_A(C)$ is contained in A_1. But since $A \cong F_2$ it follows that $A_1 \cong \mathbb{Z}$ and this implies that G_w is one-ended iff w_A is not a power of a primitive element in A. □

If the word w is a C-test word, then the JSJ decomposition of G_w is as simple as possible:

Lemma 1.9. *Let $F_2 = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle$ be a free group and $w \in F_2$ a C-test word. Let G_w be again the double of F_2 along w. Assume that F_2 does not split as an amalgamated product $\langle x \rangle *_{\langle x^n \rangle} \langle x^n, y \rangle$, where $\{x, y\}$ is a basis of F_2 and $n \geq 2$, such that $w \in \langle x^n, y \rangle$. Then the graph of groups given by the double decomposition is the JSJ decomposition of G.*

Proof. Since by Corollary 1.7 and Theorem 1.4 w is not a proper power, it follows from Remark 1.2 that w is not contained in a proper retract of F_2 and hence $w_A \in A$ and $w_B \in B$ are not primitive. Therefore it follows from Lemma 1.8 that G_w is one-ended.
Clearly w is not the commutator of a basis of F_2 and hence G_w is not the fundamental group of a closed surface of genus 2, since otherwise the splitting $F_2 *_{\langle w \rangle} F_2$ would correspond to a separating simple closed curve on the underlying surface.
Let now $\mathbb{A}$ be the JSJ decomposition of G_w and suppose that $\mathbb{A}$ is not the graph of groups corresponding to the double decomposition $F_2 *_{\langle w \rangle} F_2$. Since by assumption F_2 does not split as an amalgamated product $\langle x \rangle *_{\langle x^n \rangle} \langle x^n, y \rangle$ relative to $\langle w \rangle$, there exists a splitting of A relative $\langle w \rangle$ and a Dehn-twist along an edge e of this splitting, such that the edge group of e does not contain $\langle w \rangle$. This modular automorphism induces a non-trivial outer automorphism $\alpha \in \mathrm{Out}(F_2)$. This implies the existence of an automorphism $\tilde{\alpha} \in \mathrm{Aut}(F_2)$ fixing w, which is not conjugation by (possibly a power of) w, yielding a contradiction to Remark 1.2 (2). □

Theorem 1.10. *Let $w \in F_2$ be an Ivanov word and $G_w = A *_{\langle w \rangle} B$ be the double of F_2 along w. Then the first layer of the Makanin-Razborov diagram of G_w (as a F_2-limit group) consists of two epimorphisms, namely the canonical retraction $\pi : G_w \to F_2$ and the projection $\eta : G_w \to \mathbb{Z}^2 * \mathbb{Z}^2$.*

Proof. First note that G_w is clearly a F_2-limit group. This follows from the fact that w is not a proper power and therefore we can embed G_w into the extension of centralizer along $\langle w \rangle$.
Suppose that F_2 splits as an amalgamated product $\langle x \rangle *_{\langle x^n \rangle} \langle x^n, y \rangle$, where $n \geq 2$ and $\{x, y\}$ is a basis of F_2, such that $w \in \langle x^n, y \rangle$. Then the image of x under every homomorphism $\varphi : G_w \to F_2$ is determined by the image of x^n. Hence to construct the MR diagram of G_w it suffices to understand all homomorphisms from $H_w := \langle x^n, y \rangle *_{\langle w \rangle} \langle x^n, y \rangle \leq G_w$ to F_2, i.e. construct the MR diagram for H_w. Therefore we can assume without loss of generality that F_2 does not split as such an amalgamated product $\langle x \rangle *_{\langle x^n \rangle} \langle x^n, y \rangle$. Hence it follows from Lemma 1.9 that the decomposition $G_w = A *_C B$ given by the double construction is the JSJ decomposition of G_w.
Let $\varphi : G_w \to F_2$ be a homomorphism. We distinguish several cases:
(1) Assume that either $\varphi(A) \cong \mathbb{Z}$, $\varphi(B) = 1$ or $\varphi(A) = 1$, $\varphi(B) \cong \mathbb{Z}$. In both cases $\varphi(w) = 1$, hence φ factors through η.
(2) Assume that either $\varphi(A) \cong F_2$, $\varphi(B) \in \{1, \mathbb{Z}\}$ or $\varphi(B) \cong F_2$, $\varphi(A) \in \{1, \mathbb{Z}\}$. We only consider the case that $\varphi(A) \cong F_2$, $\varphi(B) \in \{1, \mathbb{Z}\}$. $\varphi(B) = 1$ yields an immediate contradiction to $1 \neq \varphi(w_A) = \varphi(w_B)$, hence we can assume that $\varphi(B) \cong \mathbb{Z}$. Since w is a C-test word it follows from Corollary 1.5 that there exists some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\varphi|_B = \varphi|_A \circ c_{w_A^k}$. In particular $\varphi|_B$ is a monomorphism. But since $\varphi(B) \neq F_2$ this yields a contradiction.
(3) Assume that $\varphi(A) \cong \mathbb{Z} \cong \varphi(B)$. Since w is the Ivanov word, Corollary 1.7 and Theorem 1.4 imply that $\varphi(w) = 1$. Hence φ factors through the projection $\tilde{\eta} : G \to A/\langle\langle w_A \rangle\rangle * B/\langle\langle w_B \rangle\rangle$. Let L_A, L_B be maximal limit quotients of $A/\langle\langle w_A \rangle\rangle$, $B/\langle\langle w_B \rangle\rangle$ respectively. Then $L_A * L_B$ is a maximal limit quotient of $A/\langle\langle w_A \rangle\rangle * B/\langle\langle w_B \rangle\rangle$ hence φ factors (w.o.l.g) through the projection $\eta : G_w \to L_A * L_B$. Note that since $L_A * L_B$ is a limit group and $L_A = \eta(A), L_B = \eta(B)$ are two-generated subgroups (hence also limit groups), Theorem 6.5.2 in [FGMRS] implies that $L_A, L_B \in \{\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}^2, F_2\}$. But since $\eta|_A, \eta|_B$ are clearly not injective, $L_A, L_B \in \{\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}^2\}$.
Since $w \in [F_2, F_2]$ we have that $\langle\langle w \rangle\rangle \subset [F_2, F_2]$ and $G_w^{ab} \cong \mathbb{Z}^4$. Therefore G_w^{ab} is a quotient of $A/\langle\langle w_A \rangle\rangle * B/\langle\langle w_B \rangle\rangle$. Suppose that $L_A * L_B$ is a quotient of G_w^{ab}. But since $L_A * L_B$ is either isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z} * \mathbb{Z}$ or to $\mathbb{Z}^2 * \mathbb{Z}^2$ it is not abelian, a contradiction. Hence G_w^{ab} is a quotient of $L_A * L_B$ and therefore $L_A, L_B \ncong \mathbb{Z}$. We conclude that $L_A * L_B \cong \mathbb{Z}^2 * \mathbb{Z}^2$.
(4) Assume that $\varphi(A) \cong F_2 \cong \varphi(B)$. It follows from Corollary 1.5 that there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\varphi|_B = \varphi|_A \circ c_{w_A^k}$. Hence after precomposing with a Dehn-twist α along the single edge of the JSJ-decomposition of G_w, $\varphi \circ \alpha$ factors through $\pi : A *_{\langle w \rangle} B \to A$. To be more precise $\alpha : G_w \to G_w$ is given by $\alpha|_A = \mathrm{id}$ and $\alpha|_B = c_{w_B^k}$ and we have then $\varphi = \varphi_A \circ \pi \circ \alpha$. It remains to show that $A \cong F_2$ is a maximal limit quotient of G_w. Suppose not, i.e. there exists a maximal limit quotient L of G_w such that A is a proper quotient of L.
Let $\varphi_n : G_w \to F_2$ be a sequence of short homomorphisms (here short always means short with respect to precomposition with modular automorphisms of G_w and postcomposition with conjugation by elements of F_2, for a formal definition see [Se]), such that $L = G_w/\varinjlim(\varphi_n)$ is the corresponding maximal limit quotient of G_w, where

$$\varinjlim(\varphi_n) = \{g \in G \mid \varphi_n(g) = 1 \text{ for allmost all } n\}$$

is the stable kernel of the sequence (φ_n). For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the homomorphism φ_n factors through π after precomposition with a power of the Dehn-twist α along the single edge of $A *_{\langle w \rangle} B$, i.e. there exists a sequence (k_n) of positive integers such that $\varphi_n = \pi \circ \alpha^{k_n}$ for all $n \geq 1$. Assume that the sequence (k_n) has no upper bound. L is a shortening quotient of G_w, hence in particular a proper quotient of G_w and therefore $\varinjlim(\varphi_n) \neq 1$. If (k_n) is unbounded, then it follows that for all $g \in G_w$ $\varphi_n(g) = \pi \circ \alpha^{k_n}(g) \neq 1$ for almost all $n \geq 1$, a contradiction. Hence after passing to a subsequence we can assume that $\varphi_n = \pi \circ \alpha^k$ for some fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and therefore without loss of generality $\varphi_n = \pi$, which implies that $L = F_A$. □



Figure 1: The MR diagram for G_w

Corollary 1.11. *Let $w \in F_2$ be the Ivanov word and G_w be the double of F_2 along w. Then G_w is not freely subgroup separable.*

Proof. Let $g = [b_1, b_2] \in G_w$, Then g cannot be separated from A in a free quotient. Indeed assume there exists a homomorphism $\varphi : G_w \to F_2$ such that $\varphi(g) \notin \varphi(A)$. By Theorem 1.10 and the basic properties of a MR diagram, after possibly precomposing with a Dehn-twist along $\langle w \rangle$, φ factors through (at least) one of the homomorphisms π or η. Since $\eta(B) \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$ it follows that $\varphi(g) = 1 \in \varphi(A)$ if φ factors through η. Now assume that φ factors through π. But then the resolution ends after π and there exists a Dehn-twist α and a monomorphism $\Psi : A \to F_2$ such that $\varphi(g) = \Psi \circ \pi \circ \alpha(g) \in \Psi \circ \pi(B) = \Psi \circ \pi(A) = \varphi(A)$. □

2 JSJ-decompositions of doubles of a free group of rank 2

In this section we will give a description of the possible JSJ-decompositions in the sense of Rips and Sela in [RiSe] of (one-ended) doubles of a free group in two generators and their corresponding modular groups. Recall that we view the modular group of a group G as a subgroup of $\mathrm{Out}(G)$.
Recall that G_w is the double of $F_2 = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle$ along $\mathbb{Z}$ given by the embedding $\iota : \mathbb{Z} \to F_2, 1 \mapsto w$, for some $w \in F_2$. By Lemma 1.8 G_w is one-ended if and only if w is not a power of a primitive element in F_2. Therefore if G_w is not one-ended then G_w has a free decomposition of the form

$$G_w \cong \langle y \rangle * \langle x \rangle *_{\langle w = x^n \rangle} \langle x \rangle * \langle y \rangle$$

for some basis $\{x, y\}$ of F_2. Hence from now on we will only be interested in one-ended doubles G_w.
First we give some necessary and sufficient conditions on w such that the JSJ decomposition of G_w is as simple as possible, i.e. it is just the double decomposition $A *_C B$.
Later we describe the JSJ decomposition of G_w in the case that at least one of these conditions is violated. In the following Proposition we collect some results which will be of use later.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $G \cong F_2$ be a free group on two generators.*

(1) [KaSo] G does not split as a proper amalgamated product along a non-trivial malnormal subgroup C.

(2) [KaWe1] (Proposition 3.7) Suppose G splits as a non-trivial amalgamated product $A *_C B$ along $C \cong \mathbb{Z}$. Then there exist $x, y \in G$ and $n > 1$, such that $G = \langle x, y \rangle$, $A = \langle x \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}$, $B = \langle x^n, y \rangle \cong F_2$ and $A *_C B = \langle x \rangle *_{\langle x^n \rangle} \langle x^n, y \rangle$. In particular C is malnormal in B.

(3) [KaWe1] (Lemma 3.6, Proposition 3.8) Suppose G splits as an HNN extension $H*_C$ where $C \cong \mathbb{Z}$. Then $G = \langle H, t \mid ta^n t^{-1} = b \rangle$ for some $n \geq 1$ and elements $a, b \in G$ with no roots. In particular $\langle a \rangle$ and $\langle b \rangle$ are malnormal in H. Moreover there exist $h \in H$ such that $G = \langle ht, a \rangle$ and $H = \langle a, hbh^{-1} \rangle = \langle a, (ht)a^n(ht)^{-1} \rangle$.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $F_2 = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle$ be a free group, $w \in F_2$ and G_w the double of F_2 along w. Then the graph of groups given by this decomposition is the JSJ decomposition of G if none of the following holds:*

(1) w is conjugate to $[x_1, x_2]$ or $[x_1, x_2]^{-1}$.

(2) w is contained in a subgroup generated by $\{xyx^{-1}, y\}$ for some basis $\{x, y\}$ of F_2

(3) w is contained in a subgroup generated by $\{x^n, y\}$ for some basis $\{x, y\}$ of F_2 and some $n \geq 2$.

Proof. Assume that w does not satisfy any of the properties $(1) - (3)$. Property (2) implies in particular that w is not a power of a primitive element in F_2. Hence it follows from Lemma 1.8 that G_w is one-ended.
By property (1) w is not the commutator of two primitive elements in F_2 since the commutator of a basis of F_2 is either conjugate to $[x_1, x_2]$ or to $[x_1, x_2]^{-1}$, hence G is not the fundamental group of a closed surface of genus 2, since otherwise the given splitting $A *_C B$ would correspond to a separating simple closed curve on the underlying surface.
Therefore it suffices to show that A and B do not admit any further splittings along $\mathbb{Z}$ relative to $\langle w \rangle$.
First suppose that $A = R_1 *_D R_2$ is a non-trivial relative splitting, where $D \cong \mathbb{Z}$. From Proposition 2.1 (2) follows the existence of $r, h \in A$ and $n > 1$, such that

$$F_2 \cong A = R_1 *_D R_2 = \langle r \rangle *_{\{r^n = b\}} \langle b, h \rangle = \langle r \rangle *_{\{r^n = r^n\}} \langle r^n, h \rangle,$$

in particular $A = \langle r, h \rangle$.
Since w is not contained in any subgroup generated by $\{x^n, y\}$ for some basis $\{x, y\}$ of A and some $n > 1$ this implies that $w \notin R_1, R_2$, a contradiction.

Now suppose that A splits as an HNN-extension $R*_{\mathbb{Z}}$ relative w. From Proposition 2.1 (3) follows that $A = \langle R, t \mid ta^n t^{-1} = b\rangle$ for some $n \geq 1$ and elements $a, b \in A$. Moreover there exist $h \in R$ such that $A = \langle ht, a\rangle$ and $R = \langle a, (ht)a^n(ht)^{-1}\rangle$. Since by assumption $w \notin \langle x, yxy^{-1}\rangle$ for every basis $\{x, y\}$ of A, this implies that $w \notin R$. □

Theorem 2.3. *Let G_w be the (one-ended) double of F_2 along w.*

(1) If w satisfies property (1) *from Proposition 2.2, then G_w is the fundamental group of a surface Σ of genus* 2 *and the JSJ-decomposition of G_w consists of a single vertex with QH vertex group G_w. In this case* $\mathrm{Mod}(G_w) \cong \mathrm{MCG}(\Sigma)$.

(2) If w satisfies property (3) *from Proposition 2.2, but not property (2), then the JSJ decomposition of G_w is either as in Figure 4 with modular group isomorphic to* $\mathrm{MCG}(\Sigma) \cong \mathrm{PSL}(2,\mathbb{Z}) \ltimes (\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2)$, *where Σ is the 4-punctured sphere, or has only rigid vertices and is one of the graphs of groups which we get by refining the vertices A and B in $A *_C B$ by one of the following two graphs of groups:*

(a) $\langle x^n, y\rangle *_{\langle x^n\rangle} \langle x\rangle$

(b) $\langle y\rangle *_{\langle y^m\rangle} \langle x^n, y^m\rangle *_{\langle x^n\rangle} \langle x\rangle$.

(3) If w satisfies property (2) *from Proposition 2.2, but not property (3), then the JSJ decomposition of G_w is either the graph of groups*

$$\langle y\rangle * \langle xyx^{-1}, y\rangle *_{\langle w\rangle} \langle xyx^{-1}, y\rangle *_{\langle y\rangle}$$

or the graph of groups which we get by substituting one of the three graphs of groups in Figure 5 for A and B, or the graph of groups as in Figure 7.

(4) If w satisfies (2) *and* (3) *from Proposition 2.2 then the JSJ decomposition of G_w is one of the graph of groups which we get by refining the vertices A and B in $A *_C B$ by either*

$$\langle y\rangle *_{\langle y^k\rangle} \langle y^k, xy^n x^{-1}\rangle *_{\{ty^n t^{-1} = xy^n x^{-1}\}}$$

or

$$\langle xyx^{-1}\rangle *_{\langle xy^k x^{-1}\rangle} \langle y^m, xy^k x^{-1}\rangle *_{\{ty^m t^{-1} = xy^m x^{-1}\}}$$

or the graph of groups as in Figure 7.

We split the proof of the theorem in several lemmas.

Lemma 2.4. *Assume w is conjugate to either $[x_1, x_2]$ or $[x_1, x_2]^{-1}$. Then G_w is the fundamental group of a closed surface Σ of genus* 2 *and the JSJ decomposition of G_w consists of a single vertex with QH vertex group G_w.*

Proof. If w is conjugate to either $[x_1, x_2]$ or $[x_1, x_2]^{-1}$, then there exists a basis $\{x, y\}$ of F_2 such that $w = [x, y]$. We identify A and B with the fundamental group of a once-punctured torus with boundary component corresponding to $[x, y]$. Then clearly G_w is the fundamental group of a surface of genus 2 which we get by gluing the two punctured tori along their boundary component and the splitting of G_w along C corresponds to a simple closed curve on this surface. □

From now on we suppose that G_w is not the fundamental group of a closed surface of genus 2.

Lemma 2.5. *If $w \in \langle x^n, y\rangle$ for some $n > 1$ and some basis $\{x, y\}$ of F_2 and $w \notin \langle bab^{-1}, a\rangle$ for any basis $\{a, b\}$ of F_2, then the JSJ decomposition of G_w is either as in Figure 4 (with $m > 1$), or one of the graphs of groups which we get by refining the vertices A and B in $A *_C B$ by one of the following two graphs of groups:*

(a) $\langle x^n, y\rangle *_{\langle x^n\rangle} \langle x\rangle$

(b) $\langle y\rangle *_{\langle y^m\rangle} \langle x^n, y^m\rangle *_{\langle x^n\rangle} \langle x\rangle$.

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 2.2 we conclude that there exists no splitting of F_2 as an HNN-extension relative to w, but there exists (at least) one splitting of F_2 as an amalgamated product relative to w.
Let $n > 1$ be maximal such that $\langle x^n, y\rangle *_{\langle x^n\rangle} \langle x\rangle$ is such a splitting relative to w which does not correspond to a splitting along a non-boundary parallel, closed curve on a QH subgroup of G_w (such a splitting exists since G_w is not the fundamental group of a surface of genus 2). Assume that $w \notin \langle x^n, y^m\rangle$ for any $m > 1$ and suppose that there exists a splitting as an amalgamated product of $\langle x^n, y\rangle$ relative to w and $\langle x^n\rangle$. Hence by using Proposition 2.1 (2) we can refine $\langle x^n, y\rangle *_{\langle x^n\rangle} \langle x\rangle$ to say

$$\langle e\rangle *_{\langle e^k\rangle} \langle x^n, h\rangle *_{\langle x^n\rangle} \langle x\rangle$$

for some $h \in \langle x^n, y\rangle$ and $k > 1$. We denote this graph of groups by $\mathbb{A}$ and the corresponding Bass-Serre tree by T_A. We moreover identify $F(x, y)$ with $\pi_1(\mathbb{A})$.
By Theorem 1A in [KaWe2] $\{x, y\}$ is Nielsen equivalent to $\{f, s\}$ such that either

(a) $T_f \cap T_s \neq \emptyset$ and s and f act elliptically on T_A or

(b) $T_f \cap sT_f \neq \emptyset$ and s acts hyperbolically and f acts elliptically on T_A,

where $T_f := \{v \in T_A \mid f^z v = v \text{ for some } z \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}\}$ is the subtree of T_A consisting of all points fixed by a power of f. Without loss of generality we assume that $f = x$ and $s = y$.
Suppose we are in case (b), i.e. y acts hyperbolically and x acts elliptically on T_A and $\langle x^n \rangle$ is by Proposition 2.1 (2) malnormal in $\langle x^n, h \rangle$. Moreover $\langle x^n \rangle$ is conjugacy separated from $\langle e^k \rangle$, i.e. $g\langle e^k \rangle g^{-1} \cap \langle x^n \rangle = 1$ for all $g \in F(x, y)$. Therefore T_x is the star of the vertex stabilized by $\langle x \rangle$ and all other vertices of T_x are stabilized by conjugates of $\langle x^n, h \rangle$, while the edges are stabilized by $\langle x^n \rangle$. Clearly yT_x is of the same form. Since we are in case (b) we have that $T_x \cap yT_x \neq \emptyset$ (see Figure 2). But then $T := \langle x, y \rangle T_x \subset T_A$ is a $F(x, y)$-invariant subtree,



Figure 2: $T_x \cup yT_x$

a contradiction to the minimality of $\mathbb{A}$. Therefore y cannot act hyperbolically on T_A and we are in case (a), i.e. $T_x \cap T_y \neq \emptyset$ and y acts elliptically on T_A.
Hence either y is conjugate into $\langle e \rangle$ or into $\langle x^n, h \rangle$ (since y is not conjugate into $\langle x \rangle$). So suppose that y is conjugate to an element of $\langle x^n, h \rangle$. But since $T_x \cap T_y \neq \emptyset$, this implies that

$$T_A/_{F(x,y)} = g\langle x^n, h \rangle g^{-1} *_{\langle x^n \rangle} \langle x \rangle$$

for some $g \in F(x, y)$, a contradiction to the reducedness of $\mathbb{A}$.
Therefore y is conjugate to an element of $\langle e \rangle$, hence since y is primitive $y = geg^{-1}$ for some $g \in F(x, y)$. Since $T_y \cap T_x \neq \emptyset$ there exists an isomorphism of graphs of groups from

$$\langle y \rangle *_{\langle y^k \rangle} \langle x^n, y^k \rangle *_{\langle x^n \rangle} \langle x \rangle \text{ to } \langle e \rangle *_{\langle e^k \rangle} \langle x^n, e^k \rangle *_{\langle x^n \rangle} \langle x \rangle.$$

In particular there exists an automorphism $\alpha \in \mathrm{Aut}(F_2)$ mapping $H = \langle y^k, x^n \rangle$ onto $H' = \langle e^k, x^n \rangle$. But since the images of e and $y = geg^{-1}$ in the abelianization of $F(x, y)$ are equal, this immediately implies that α is an inner automorphism and hence since it fixes x we conclude that $g = x^m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore $H = H'$, $w \in H = \langle x^n, y^k \rangle$ and $\langle y \rangle *_{\langle y^k \rangle} \langle x^n, y^k \rangle *_{\langle x^n \rangle} \langle x \rangle$ is a splitting of $F(x, y)$ relative w, a contradiction to the assumption that no such splitting of $F(x, y)$ exists.
Therefore the JSJ decomposition of G_w is the graph of groups which we get by refining both A and B in $A *_C B$ by $\langle x^n, y \rangle *_{\langle x^n \rangle} \langle x \rangle$ and all vertex groups are rigid. This is true since $\langle x^n, y \rangle *_{\langle w \rangle} \langle x^n, y \rangle$ can't be a QH subgroup, because then cutting the underlying surface along the curve corresponding to w, would yield a surface with 2 boundary components and fundamental group F_2, a contradiction (see Figure 3). Hence all vertices in the JSJ decomposition are rigid.
In this case the Dehn twists along the edges with edge group $\langle x^n \rangle$ induce inner automorphisms and hence



Figure 3: G_w does not contain a QH subgroup

the only non-inner modular automorphism of G_w is the Dehn twist along the edge with edge group C, hence $\mathrm{Mod}(G_w) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ (for a definition of Dehn twist see [RiSe]).
Now we assume that there exists some (maximal) $m > 1$ such that $w \in \langle x^n, y^m \rangle$. Then clearly

$$\langle y \rangle *_{\langle y^m \rangle} \langle x^n, y^m \rangle *_{\langle x^n \rangle} \langle x \rangle$$

is a splitting of $F(x, y)$ relative to w and we cannot refine $\langle x^n, y^m \rangle$ further as an amalgamated product relative to $\langle x^n, y^m \rangle$.
Now assume that w is conjugate to $(x^n y^m)^{\pm 1}$ in $\langle x^n y^m \rangle$. Then $\langle x^n, y^m \rangle *_{\langle w \rangle} \langle x^n, y^m \rangle$ is the fundamental group of a surface with genus 0 and 4 boundary components, two corresponding to $\langle x^n \rangle$ and two corresponding to $\langle y^m \rangle$, and hence the JSJ decomposition of G_w is a graph of groups with one QH subgroup, which is the fundamental



Figure 4: The JSJ decomposition of G_w if w is conjugate to $(x^n y^m)^{\pm 1}$





Figure 5: The possible relative JSJ decompositions of F_2 in the HNN-splitting case

group of this surface, and four rigid vertices with vertex group isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$ connected to the four boundary components (see Figure 4). In this case the modular group of G_w is isomorphic to $\mathrm{MCG}(\Sigma)$, where Σ is the 4-punctured sphere.
Now assume that w is not conjugate to $(x^n y^m)^{\pm 1}$. Then refining A and B by

$$\langle y \rangle *_{\langle y^m \rangle} \langle x^n, y^m \rangle *_{\langle x^n \rangle} \langle x \rangle$$

yields the JSJ decomposition of G_w. In particular all vertex groups are rigid. This holds since contrary to the case above, $\langle x^n, y^m \rangle *_{\langle w \rangle} \langle x^n, y^m \rangle$ cannot be a QH subgroup, because otherwise cutting the underlying surface Σ along the curve corresponding to w, would yield two copies of a surface S with 3 boundary components and it is well-known that $\pi_1(S)$ is generated by the elements x^n and y^m corresponding to the boundary components of Σ, hence has no genus (see Figure 4), and the third boundary component is generated by a conjugate of $(x^n y^m)^{\pm 1}$ and therefore w is conjugate to $(x^n y^m)^{\pm 1}$, a contradiction. Again only the Dehn twist along the original edge gives a non-inner modular automorphism, and hence $\mathrm{Mod}(G_w) \cong \mathbb{Z}$. □

Lemma 2.6. *If $w \in \langle xyx^{-1}, y \rangle$ for some basis $\{x, y\}$ of F_2 and $w \notin \langle a^n, b \rangle$ for any basis $\{a, b\}$ of F_2 and any $n > 1$, then the JSJ decomposition of G_w has either only rigid vertices and is one of the graph of groups which we get by substituting one of the three graphs of groups in Figure 5 for A and B, or has one QH vertex and is the graph of groups in Figure 7.*

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 2.2 we conclude that there exists no splitting of F_2 as an amalgamated product relative to w. But since $w \in \langle xyx^{-1}, y \rangle$ for some basis $\{x, y\}$ of F_2 there exists (at least) one relative splitting of F_2 as an HNN-extension of the form $\langle xyx^{-1}, y \rangle *_{\langle y \rangle}$ with the embeddings $y \mapsto xyx^{-1}$ and $y \mapsto y$ which does moreover not correspond to a non-boundary parallel closed curve on a surface corresponding to a QH subgroup of G_w, since by assumption G_w is not the fundamental group of a closed surface. Since F_2 projects onto the fundamental group of the underlying graph of any refinement of A, it follows that the first Betty number of any refinement of A is at most one. Hence a (relative) refinement of $\langle xyx^{-1}, y \rangle$ has to be an amalgamated product, say $X *_E Y$. By Proposition 2.1 we can assume that $X \cong \mathbb{Z}$. Since by assumption there does not exist a splitting of $F(x, y)$ as an amalgamated product relative w, we conclude that the refined graph of groups has no separating edge and hence we can assume that either $X = \langle y \rangle$ or $X = \langle xyx^{-1} \rangle$ (see Figure 6). Moreover we conclude that either $E = \langle y^m \rangle$ or $E = \langle xy^m x^{-1} \rangle$ for some $m > 1$. Hence the resulting graph of groups (after plugging in $X *_E Y$ for $\langle xyx^{-1}, y \rangle$) is not reduced and after collapsing the original edge, we get one of the following graphs of groups:

$$\langle xyx^{-1}, y^m \rangle *_{\langle y^m \rangle} \text{ or } \langle xy^m x^{-1}, y \rangle *_{\langle xy^m x^{-1} \rangle}$$

and therefore this new graph of groups is just an unfolding of the original one (see Figure 6). For a definition of an unfolding we refer the reader to [PaFu].



Figure 6: Unfolding the graph of groups in the HNN case

So if we choose $m, n \geq 1$ maximal such that $w \in \langle y^m, xy^n x^{-1} \rangle$ and w is not conjugate to $(y^m xy^n x^{-1})^{\pm 1}$, it follows that (depending on w) the only possible relative JSJ decompositions of F_2 relative w (up to folding) are the three decompositions shown in Figure 5. It follows as in the amalgamated product case that all vertex groups are rigid and the JSJ decomposition is unfolded.
Note that in the case that $m, n > 1$ (and hence the splitting is the bottom graph of groups of Figure 5), we have that $m \neq kn$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ since otherwise if $m = kn$ then $\langle y^m \rangle \subset \langle y^n \rangle$ and we can slide one edge group over the other and get a non-trivial amalgamated product, a contradiction).
In all cases the modular group of G_w is generated by the Dehn-twists along the original edge and the edges of the relative JSJ decomposition of F_2. Note that the unfolding move, mentioned above does not change the modular group, since the Dehn-twists are not along elements of the edge group, but elements of the centralizer of the edge group in the vertex group, and these centralizers do not change under unfoldings.
So assume now that $m \neq n \geq 1$ are maximal such that w is conjugate to $(y^m xy^n x^{-1})^{\pm 1}$. Then $\langle y^m, xy^n x^{-1} \rangle *_{\langle w \rangle}$ $\langle y^m, xy^n x^{-1} \rangle$ is the fundamental group of the 4-punctured sphere, i.e. the surface with genus 0 and 4 boundary components, two corresponding to $\langle y^m \rangle$ and two corresponding to $\langle xy^n x^{-1} \rangle$, and hence the JSJ decomposition of G_w is the graph of groups with one QH subgroup, which is the fundamental group of this surface, and two rigid vertices with vertex group isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$ each connected to two boundary components (see Figure 7). □



Figure 7: The JSJ decomposition of G_w if w is conjugate to $(y^m xy^n x^{-1})^{\pm 1}$

Lemma 2.7. *If $w \in \langle a^n, b \rangle$ for some $n > 1$ and some basis $\{a, b\}$ of F_2 and moreover $w \in \langle xyx^{-1}, y \rangle$ for some basis $\{x, y\}$ of F_2, then the JSJ decomposition of G_w is one of the graph of groups which we get by refining the vertices A and B in $A *_C B$ by either*

$$\langle y \rangle *_{\langle y^k \rangle} \langle y^k, xy^n x^{-1} \rangle *_{\{ty^n t^{-1} = xy^n x^{-1}\}}$$

or

$$\langle xyx^{-1} \rangle *_{\langle xy^k x^{-1} \rangle} \langle y^m, xy^k x^{-1} \rangle *_{\{ty^m t^{-1} = xy^m x^{-1}\}},$$

where $k \leq n$ or $k \leq m$ respectively, or the graph of groups as in Figure 7. Except for the last case, where we have one QH vertex, there are only rigid vertices in the JSJ decomposition.

Proof. Again it suffices to consider the JSJ decomposition of F_2 relative w. Since $w \in \langle xyx^{-1}, y \rangle$ for some basis $\{x, y\}$ of F_2, F_2 admits in particular a relative splitting as in Lemma 2.6, i.e. a splitting which is of one of the three types in Figure 5. But clearly the third type of splitting (the one with two edges) does not admit any further refinement of a vertex group as an amalgamated product, which contradicts our assumption. Hence F_2 admits a splitting relative w of the form:

$$\langle y^n, xyx^{-1} \rangle *_{\{ty^n t^{-1} = xy^n x^{-1}\}}$$

or

$$\langle y, xy^m x^{-1}\rangle *_{\{ty^m t^{-1}=xy^m x^{-1}\}}$$

for some maximal $m, n \geq 1$. And moreover by assumption there exists a further refinement of the vertex group as an amalgamated product. So let $k > 1$ maximal such that $\langle e\rangle *_{\langle e^k\rangle} H$ is a splitting of $\langle y, xy^m x^{-1}\rangle$ as an amalgamated product relative to $\langle y^m\rangle$ and $\langle xy^m x^{-1}\rangle$ (we only consider the second case, the first one is identical). We want to show that $e = y$, so let $\mathbb{A}$ be the graph of groups which we get by refining the vertex group in

$$\langle y, xy^m x^{-1}\rangle *_{\{ty^m t^{-1}=xy^m x^{-1}\}}$$

by $\langle e\rangle *_{\langle e^k\rangle} H$ and denote by T_A the corresponding Bass-Serre tree. First we note that x acts hyperbolically on T_A, since otherwise

$$x \in \langle e\rangle *_{\langle e^k\rangle} H = \langle y, xy^m x^{-1}\rangle$$

and hence $\langle y, xy^m x^{-1}\rangle = F(x, y)$, a contradiction. As in the proof of Lemma 2.5 we can without loss of generality deduce from Theorem 1A in [KaWe2] that either

(a) $T_x \cap T_y \neq \emptyset$ and x, y act elliptically on T_a or

(b) $T_y \cap xT_y \neq \emptyset$ and x acts hyperbolically, y elliptically on T_A.

But since x acts hyperbolically, we are clearly in case (b). Hence y acts elliptically on T_A and therefore is either conjugate to an element of H or conjugate to e.
So suppose that y is not conjugate to e, i.e. y is conjugate into H. Then $T_y \subset T_A$ is the star of the vertex stabilized by H and all other vertices of T_y are stabilized by conjugates of H, while the edges are stabilized by $\langle y^m\rangle$. Clearly xT_y is of the same form. Since $T_y \cap xT_y \neq \emptyset$ we conclude that $\langle x, y\rangle T_y \subset T_A$ is an $F(x, y)$-invariant subtree, a contradiction to the minimality of $\mathbb{A}$. Hence y is conjugate to e and by the same arguments as in the amalgamated product case (Lemma 2.5) follows without loss of generality that $e = y$ and $k \leq n$. Hence F_2 has a relative splitting $\mathbb{A}$ which is of one of the two types:

$$\langle xyx^{-1}\rangle *_{\langle xy^k x^{-1}\rangle} \langle y^n, xy^k x^{-1}\rangle *_{\{ty^n t^{-1}=xy^n x^{-1}\}}$$

where $k \leq n$, or

$$\langle y\rangle *_{\langle y^k\rangle} \langle y^k, xy^m x^{-1}\rangle *_{\{ty^m t^{-1}=xy^m x^{-1}\}}$$

where $k \leq m$. Since we have chosen k maximal, by the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 2.5 $\mathbb{A}$ has no further refinement, i.e. $\mathbb{A}$ cannot have one loop edge e and two non-loop edges as in Figure 8. Therefore the



Figure 8: $\mathbb{A}$ cannot have one loop edge and two non-loop edges originating from the same vertex

relative JSJ decomposition of F_2 is of the form claimed above. To complete the proof that the JSJ decomposition of G_w has the desired form, it remains to consider QH vertices. We again only consider the case

$$\langle y\rangle *_{\langle y^k\rangle} \langle y^k, xy^m x^{-1}\rangle *_{\{ty^m t^{-1}=xy^m x^{-1}\}}.$$

Note that there exist $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $lk = m$ and therefore by sliding the edge corresponding to the loop edge over the non-loop edge we get a graph of groups which has two vertices and two non-loop edges (corresponding to HNN-extensions) connecting these vertices. Hence by the same arguments as in the HNN case (Lemma 2.6), we conclude that the JSJ decomposition is as claimed above, i.e. with only rigid vertices, if w is not conjugate to $(y^k xy^m x^{-1})^{\pm 1}$ and as in Figure 7 elsewise. In particular in this case there exists a QH subgroup.
In the rigid cases the modular group of G_w is generated by the Dehn-twists along the two loop edges and the original (non-loop) edge, while in the case where there exists a QH subgroup, $\mathrm{Mod}(G_w)$ is generated by the Dehn-twists together with the mapping class group of the 4-punctured sphere. □

References

[FGMRS] B. Fine, A. Gaglione, A. Myasnikov, G. Rosenberger, D. Spellmann, The elementary theory of groups, De Gruyter, Berlin (2014)

[Iv] S. V. Ivanov; On certain elements of free groups, J. Algebra 204 (1998), 394-405

[KaWe1] I. Kapovich, R. Weidmann, On the structure of two-generated hyperbolic groups, Math. Z. 231 (1999), 783-801

[KaWe2] I. Kapovich, R. Weidmann, Two-generated groups acting on trees, Arch. Math. 73 (1999), 172-181

[KaSo] A. Karrass, D. Solitar, The free product of two groups with malnormal amalgamated subgroup, Can. J. Math., Vol. XXIII, No. 6, 1971, 933-959

[Le] D. Lee; On certain C-test words for free groups, J. Algebra, vol.247 (2002), pp.509-540

[Mo] https://mathoverflow.net/questions/163585/can-finitely-generated-subgroups-of-limit-groups-be-detected-in-free-group-quoti

[PaFu] P. Papasoglu, K. Fujiwara, JSJ-decompositions of finitely presented groups and complexes of groups

[RiSe] E. Rips, Z.Sela, Cyclic Splittings of Finitely Presented Groups and the Canonical JSJ Decomposition, Ann. of Math., Second Series, Vol. 146, No. 1 (1997), 53-109

[Se] Z.Sela, Diophantine Geometry over groups I: Makanin-Razborov diagrams, Publications Mathematiques de l'IHES 93 (2001), 53-104

[To] N. Touikan, On the one-endedness of graphs of groups, Pacific J. Math. 278 (2015), no. 2, 463-478

[Tu] E. Turner, Test words for automorphisms of free groups, Bull. London Math. Soc. 28 (1996), no.3, 255-263

[Wi] Henry Wilton, Hall's Theorem for limit groups, Geom. Funct. Anal. 18 (2008), pp. 271-303